REMARKS

Claims 6-10 are presently pending in the application. Claim 6 is in independent form. No claims are being amended by way of this response. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 6, the only independent claim, was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpattnable over *Kane* (US Patent 6,639,555). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claim 6 recites, inter alia, "the two transmitter/receiver antenna branches are associated with overlapping frequency bands" (emphasis added). *Kane* fails to teach this element.

Claim 6 recites "the two transmitter/receiver antenna branches are associated with overlapping frequency bands." (emphasis added) The Office action concedes that this feature is not taught by *Kane* (page 4). The Office action then concludes that this difference is not patentable. However, the Office action offers no evidence to support this conclusion.

In addition, and as previously discussed, the Office action indicates that the two antenna branches of *Kane* are shown in the figures as elements 152 and 153 or alternatively as antenna elements 1652 and 1653. However, as indicated by the Examiner's annotations of the figures and as supported by the *Kane* specification, antenna element 153/1653 is a transmitting element and antenna element 152/1652 is a receiving element. Neither of these elements is a "transmitter/receiver antenna branch" as currently claimed.

Still further, these antenna element pairs of *Kane* operate on different frequencies, not "overlapping frequency bands" as currently claimed. The Office action ignores the fact that these distinctions are made clear by the *Kane* specification, which teaches away from the present invention. For example, *Kane* states:

> As shown in FIG. 2, the resonance frequencies of the receiving element 152 and the transmitting element 153 are different from each other, depending on the element lengths, and thus, the isolation between a received signal and a transmission signal can be improved. In addition, the receiving element 152 and the transmitting element 153 have an end connected to the antenna ground 151 for grounding, respectively. Since the receiving element 152 and the transmitting element 153 operate separately from each other, the antenna device can be optimized for receiving and transmitting, respectively and the reception sensitivity and the transmission efficiency can be improved. (col. 12, lines 34-46; emphasis added)

The Office action concedes that *Kane* does not disclose each and every element of independent claims 6, the Office action offers no additional evidence other than a conclusory statement to fill in this deficiency of *Kane*, and the Office action ignores the fact that *Kane* teaches away from the combination of elements in claim 6. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 6 is in condition for allowance. All other claims depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 6. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 6-10 are both novel and non-obvious over the art of record. The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned. If any additional fees are due in connection with this application as a whole, the Commissioner is authorized to deduct such fees from deposit account no. 02-1818. If such a deduction is made, please indicate the attorney docket no. (119065-32) on the account statement.

Respectfully submitted,
K&L GATES LLP

BY _____
James F. Goedken
Reg. No. 44,715
Customer No.: 24573
Phone: (312) 807-4250

Dated: November 3, 2009